

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/733,554	Applicant(s) MOLZ ET AL.	
	Examiner James L. Swiger	Art Unit 3733	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James L. Swiger. (3) _____

(2) Dustin Johnson. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 09 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 8, 42 and 51.

Identification of prior art discussed: Atkinson (6402750); Zucherman et al. (US 6,652,527) and Simonson (US Pub 2005/0101956).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

EDUARDO C. ROBERT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Representative for applicant phoned examiner for clarification of missing claims in the previous Non-Final office action. Examiner explained the pending rejection. Representative also wished to further discuss the art in light of the above claims, and their potential novelty. In the previous interpretation, the joint was interpreted as shown in the art--as a joint created by a connector with modification of an elastic substance. Upon further discussion, the representative explained that the novel concept is that it is the elastic substance that both secures the joint and allows it to articulate.